

## THE TRIBUTE QUOTA LISTS FROM 430 TO 425 B.C.

### 1. *The dating problem*

Bradeen and McGregor with exemplary skill and patience re-examined the almost desperately worn front face of *ATL* ii List 26. They were able to prove that the lines of its prescript were precisely forty-seven letters long. This excludes the possibility of dating this list 430/29 or 428/7 B.C., since only six spaces are available for the first numeral.<sup>1</sup> They rightly maintained that the *ATL* Lists 25 and 26 must be kept together, but unlike them I would challenge the *ATL* numbering and order. I still think that this should be reversed.<sup>2</sup>

In List 26 the survivors of two special pre-war categories are registered *after* the Thracian panel as they were from the start, though the panel has been moved from the end to the head of the list.<sup>3</sup> In List 25 they come at the very end, following an appendix to the Hellespontine panel.<sup>4</sup> It is only a formal point and may seem trivial. But I submit that it is indicative of an error in the accepted numbering. It is not easy to see why a secretary should have gone back to the pre-war arrangement and have treated the categories virtually as an integral part of the Thracian panel. In fact only three of the ten names left are Thracian. This looks to me rather like unreflecting continuation of previous practice. The man who prepared 'List 25' will have decided that the groups fitted better right at the end.<sup>5</sup>

This is not the only point that recommends revision. In the Ionic-Karian column of *SEG* V.25 Meritt and West restored lines 32 f. as [. . . 6 . . .] | [. . . 6 . . . ἐπιφορᾶ]ς. This was changed in *ATL* i, with a revealing note on p.196: 'The conjectural restoration . . . in . . . *SEG* V.25 must be deleted and [. . . 5 . . . ἀπὸ Καρία]ς or [. . . . 9 . . . . Κᾱρε]ς substituted as the basis for reconstruction.' By what compulsion must it? It has been accepted too tamely. Bradeen and McGregor for example keep the *ATL* reading [Κρυῆς ἀπὸ Καρία]ς without comment.<sup>6</sup> Though Χῖοι, Ἀυλιᾶται, and Πολιχναῖοι Κᾱρες occur in the early

<sup>1</sup> See *Studies in Fifth Century Attic Epigraphy* (1973), p.12 with n.10. We cannot then read πεμπτῆς or ἑβδομῆς.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., pp.20–2; see Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (1972), pp.531 and 537; Mattingly, *CQ* N.S. 16 (1966), 179–83 and *BSA* 65 (1970), 133–42.

<sup>3</sup> Compare *ATL* ii List 26.col.ii.34–49 with 21.col.vi.5–37; 22.col.ii.76–100; 23.col.ii.68–82.

<sup>4</sup> *ATL* ii List 25.col.iii.54–65. It is also worth watching the positioning of this Hellespontine appendix in the lists. In List 25 it is at the right-hand bottom corner of the front face of the stele, in 26 it is on the left lateral face, and in 27 actually at the top of the reverse face. Only in List 25 is it in immediate contact with the main Hellespontine panel.

<sup>5</sup> I made my main point already in *CQ* N.S.

16 (1966), 180. Meiggs ignored it in his rebuttal (op. cit., pp.574–7). Instead he dealt with my claim that the rubric headings in List 26 were much closer to the pre-war headings than those in List 25. I am less sure of this now, despite Meiggs's qualified approval. Bradeen and McGregor have shown that [. . . . 7 . . .] λε[. . .] οἱ | [. . . . 9 . . .] οἱ [ἐ] τα [χσ--] can be read with fair certainty in col.ii.43 f. See their p.13 and text. I do not know how to restore this, but—like Meiggs—remain extremely sceptical about the *ATL* version which Bradeen and McGregor retained ([ταῖσδε βο] λῆ [σὺν τ] οἱ [δικαστρε] οἱ [ἐ] τα [χσεν]). For typographical changes see their p.13.

<sup>6</sup> They could read no more letters than in *ATL* ii, but tacitly confirmed that crucial sigma against the blank in *IG* i<sup>2</sup> 216. See their p.17 and text.

lists, there is only one example of this usage in the period that concerns us.<sup>7</sup> For the *ATL* preference [Κρυῆς ἀπὸ Καρίας], however, there is even less support. The sole parallel is [. . . 6 . . .]ται ἀπὸ Καρίας in List 25.<sup>8</sup> A barely paralleled usage seems the wrong basis for reconstruction, if we have a choice.

The *ATL* editors abandoned the *SEG* V restoration because they had convinced themselves that formal, explicit *epiphora* was ended at the assessment of 430 B.C. It must not then appear in any later list. In List 25, supposedly the first of that assessment period, the *epiphora* mentioned is owed from the previous year.<sup>9</sup>

The argument looks a trifle circular. On purely formal grounds there can be no objection to restoring [. . . 6 . . .] and [. . . 6 . . . ἐπιφοράς], for which there is abundant precedent, in List 26. But, if we do this, then surely List 25 must follow it. Pygela is registered as paying *epiphora* due the previous year, while two Thracian allies have their current supplementary payments included in their quotas. Explicit *epiphora* has disappeared.<sup>10</sup>

There are now two possible placings for *ATL* ii List 27. It could stay in 428/7 B.C., where the 100 drachmai tribute of Notion fits admirably—just after the Notion ‘troubles’ and the settlement of the Kolophonian remnant there. But Notion’s tribute is still pegged at 100 drachmai in the 425 B.C. reassessment, so that 427/6 B.C. is equally open. The order 26, 25, 27 is at least arguable.<sup>11</sup> Another piece of evidence may seem to strengthen it.

Meritt dated 428/7 B.C. an Athenian decree which obliged Therambe to help with the upkeep of Athenian archons at Aphytis. This should surely be linked with Therambe’s curious supplementary payment in List 25.<sup>12</sup> Aige also paid a supplement of a twelfth this year. Was Aige—also in Pallene—one of ‘the other cities’ which were also to contribute, according to Meritt’s persuasive supplement in *ATL* ii D 21?<sup>13</sup> At this point in the argument we meet a real snag. In the full Thracian panel of List 25 *only* Therambe and Aige pay any supplement. Perhaps the restoration in D 21 is faulty. I would prefer to read σ[υντελ]όντων δὲ καὶ Α[ιγάντιοι .|.].ις καθάπερ Μεθωναίους κατὰ τὸ [. . .] ν ψήφισμα. The short residual gaps present difficulties. But for the first we might reasonably venture Α[ιγάντιοι αὐθ]ις.<sup>14</sup>

At this stage a more serious snag must be faced. Meritt’s dating of D 21 can hardly stand. His version starts with the dubious restoration ὀκτακοσίων μ[εδίμων]

<sup>7</sup> See *ATL* i, Register pp.440 f. (note [Χῖο]ι Κῶρε[ς] in A9 of 425 B.C.), 242 f., and 382. Apart from A 9, the latest example comes in List 4.

<sup>8</sup> The *ATL* editors read [Κεδριά]ται ἀπὸ Καρίας, since they place the only alternative Πελεῖται in Kos (see i.191 and 533).

<sup>9</sup> See *ATL* i.452 f.: Bradeen and McGregor, *op. cit.*, p.22 (*ATL* view).

<sup>10</sup> Note the entries [Πυγελ]ῆς and [Πυγε]λῆς βένες ἐπιφοράς in col.i.45 f. and the odd quotas ΔΠΗΤ-C and ΠΗΤΗ in col.ii.26 f.

<sup>11</sup> Meiggs (*op. cit.*, pp.532 f. and 536) argued that 428/7 B.C. was a probable, but not certain date for List 27. I would now agree with him. For Notion in 425 B.C. see A 9 col.ii.107 (H vacat [Νότιον]).

<sup>12</sup> See col.ii.25 and Meritt, *Hesperia* 13 (1944), 211–23, no. 2 (= *ATL* ii D 21).

For the archons and their upkeep (lines 6–8) see in particular pp.218 f. The *ATL* editors’ view of *epiphora* prevented them from seeing that Therambe’s supplement could—indeed should—be explained by this clause of the Aphytis decree. They treated both it and Aige’s parallel anomaly (col.ii.26) in List 25 as fines for late payment. For a wider view of *epiphora* (simply ‘additional payment’; it may be voluntary) see S. Eddy, *AJPh* 94 (1973), 62–4.

<sup>13</sup> Lines 7 f.: σ[υντελ]όντων δὲ καὶ α[ι] ἄλλαι πόλ[ε]ις καθάπερ Μεθωναίους κατὰ τὸ [αὐτὸ] ν ψήφισμα.

<sup>14</sup> Or Α[ιγάντιοι χω]ρ[ι]ς? Meritt’s τὸ [αὐτὸ] ν ψήφισμα involves an odd spelling (for αὐτό), but it is not unparalleled. I had earlier thought of τὸ [κοινὸ] ν here (*BSA* 65 (1970), 135 n.33).

in line 3. There is no reason for raising the question of corn imports so early. The clause probably concerns a military establishment or commitment.<sup>15</sup> The corn imports are regulated by the clause introduced by *περὶ δὲ* in line 4. From *περὶ δὲ* to the broken infinitive—*εσθαι* I would recognize a subordinate clause explaining Aphytis' need for imported food. We can then continue with *μέχρι μυρίων μεδίωνω[ν ἐξαγωγῇ] ἢ ἔστω αὐτο[ῖς καθάπερ Μ]ε[θωναίους]*. There is no need to add any further point here such as the price to be paid ('the same as for Methone').<sup>16</sup> Even in the *ATL* restoration this clause surely refers back to the first concession granted in the decree for Methone in 426/5 B.C., not to the general demand for freedom of trade in the measure that preceded that one.<sup>17</sup> The second Methone decree opens with *Μεθωναί[οις] εἰν[αι ἐχ] σα[γο] γέν[ε]ν ἐγ Βυζαντίο σίτο μέχ[ρι] . . . ακισχ[ῶ]ν ἰλίον μεδίμνον τὸ ἐναντιὸν ἑκάστο*. The Aphytis clause presupposes this. It can dispense with all superfluous detail, because this had recently been spelled out fully for Methone.<sup>18</sup>

I cannot myself see how this logic can be resisted. Therambe's extra payment for the archons in Methone was in all probability established in 426/5 B.C. The correct order of the lists will then be 27, 26, and 25 and List 25 will represent the last regular assessment before Kleon and his friends intervened with such drastic effect.<sup>19</sup>

## 2. The status of Thera before 425 B.C.

Thera was neutral in 431 B.C. together with Melos. In 425 B.C., again like Melos, the island was put on the reassessment schedule. In 418/17 B.C. it certainly paid.<sup>20</sup> Scholars have long reckoned Thera tributary before 425 B.C. The name *Θεραῖοι* has been read without serious question on the appallingly worn front face of List 26. In a clause of Kleonymos' Tribute Decree of 426/5 B.C. Thera was bracketed with Samos—both presumably as payers of war-indemnities—and these moneys were apparently separated from the tribute as such.<sup>21</sup>

A new fragment of Kleonymos' decree has improved the text in lines 20–3. I give it in a conservative version:<sup>22</sup>

<sup>15</sup> What survives runs [. . .] *ντα τα[.] ὀκτακοσίων μ[.] . . . . . 20 . . . . . ] νι[.] . . . . . 9 . . . . . ]* *π[ό]λεμον τὸ κεφάλαιον*. A force of 800 men would suit the general context, which concerns defence matters.

<sup>16</sup> Meritt's restoration—as in *ATL* ii—was—*μεδίμνω[ν] ἢ δὲ τιμ[ῇ] ἔστω αὐτο[ῖς καθάπερ Μ]ε[θωναίους]*. Purely *exempli gratia*—to show the structure of the sentence, as I see it—I would hazard the supplement *περὶ δὲ τ[ὸ] σίτο δ[ὲ] εἰς[τα]ῖς Ἀφυ[ταῖοι] εἰσφέ[ρ]εσθαι, μέχρι μυρίων μεδίμνω[ν] ἐξαγωγῇ] ἢ ἔστω αὐτο[ῖς καθάπερ Μ]ε[θωναίους]*.

<sup>17</sup> As Meritt argued in *Hesperia* 13 (1944), 216. I challenged this in *CQ* N.S. 11 (1961), 161 with n.5 and, despite his brief attempt at refutation in *GRBS* 8 (1967), 51 f., I think that my point has not yet been answered.

<sup>18</sup> In the Methone clause we find the import defined as an annual quota from Byzantium,

free of duty and subject only to prior notification of the Hellenophylakes. For the text see *IG* i<sup>2</sup>.57 (*ATL* ii D 4).34–41.

<sup>19</sup> The Hellenotamias [*Δι*]ο[*νύ*]σω[ς] 'Αχαρ[νεύς] in List 25 (prescript, line 3) is presumably the chairman to whom money was paid in 426/5 B.C. See *IG* i<sup>2</sup>.324 (Meiggs and Lewis no. 72), 2 f., *ἑλλ[ε]νοταμία[ις] . . . . . 10 . . . . . ] εἰ καὶ χονδράχοσι[ν] ---[.]*.

<sup>20</sup> See *Thuc.*2.9.4 and *ATL* ii A 9, col.i.65 and 68; List '33' (Meiggs and Lewis—henceforth *ML*—no. 75), col.i.10.

<sup>21</sup> See col.iii.23 and the improved text of *IG* i<sup>2</sup>.65+ in *ATL* ii D 8.21–5. U. Köhler was the first to read [Θ]ε[ρ]α[ῖ]οι; see *IG* i.257 (pp.137 f.).

<sup>22</sup> Essentially I follow *ML* no. 68, where Meritt's tentative textual suggestions are reported on p.186. For his comment see *AJPh* 88 (1967), 30.

stoich.36

— ἔ] στο δὲ καὶ Σα

μίοις καὶ Θεραίοι [ς . . . . 8 . . . .] σ[.]ι[.]σ[.]ι[.]ι[.]τ[.]

ὄν χρημάτων ὄν τε χ[.] . . . 8 . . .] ἐν τῆς αἰρέσεως

[τ] ὄν ἀνδρῶν —

I find this disturbing, but it does not seem to have worried other scholars. Meritt commented thus in publishing it: 'In fact this decree does not apply to Samos and Thera . . . cities that made contributions of money other than tribute (*phoros*) in the strict sense of that term. They were to have no collectors for these other moneys . . . Samos never paid tribute, but Thera paid both tribute and indemnity.'<sup>22</sup> Meiggs and Lewis add a similar gloss: 'The decree is then applied with certain modifications to . . . payments by Samos, Thera and other cities (with similar obligations) which are not tribute payments . . . Thera differs from Samos in paying tribute as well as indemnity.'<sup>23</sup> There seems to be faulty logic here. The decree was being applied not to 'payments' by these two cities, but to the cities themselves. They were not to have 'no collectors for these other moneys'. They were to have no collectors at all. The decree began by laying on *all* tributaries the duty of appointing collectors. Samos did not pay tribute and so needed special mention; if it was to be brought in some way under the terms of this decree. But if Thera *was* tributary, then the decree applied to Thera. No modification—least of all one concerned with the appointment of the tribute collectors—was needed in Thera's case.<sup>24</sup>

Bradeen and McGregor were aware that I had questioned the tributary status of Thera before 425 B.C. They therefore studied the crucial entry in col. iii of List 26 with special care. They declared themselves satisfied with the reading and added an undotted iota. Thera, it would seem, must be accepted.<sup>25</sup>

We should first note their frank admissions on the state of the stone and the problems of decipherment. 'The obverse surface,' they write, ' . . . is in appalling condition . . . Much of the stone is worn, eroded, and scarred.' At the right-hand corner of the smooth upper section, however, letters were easier to read and showed the tell-tale rust-coloured patina often found in letters cut in Pentelic marble. Elsewhere only such patina survived where cuttings may once have been. 'We believe that these traces frequently represent' they declare, 'all that survives of letters and have accordingly made the appropriate identifications.' The word 'frequently' should be noted. Where such traces occurred between or outside *stoichoi*, they would tend to be ignored. When the traces of patination were *not* 'appropriate', they could also be ruled out. I make this point in no denigrating spirit, but simply to show that there is inevitably a subjective element of choice.<sup>26</sup>

More closely relevant are some later passages in their commentary. On line 1 of the prescript they write: 'Few traces of the relative pronoun . . . are clearly

<sup>23</sup> See *ML* p.187. Meritt thought that a separate decree was needed for Samos and Thera and restored accordingly.

<sup>24</sup> See D 8.5–7 [βοπόσ]αι πόλες φόρο|ν φέροσ[ι] 'Αθ]ενα[ίους] αἰρέσθον| ἐν ἐκάστῃ τῇ[ι] πόλει [φόρο] ἐγλογέας] (a plausible restoration, retained in *ML*). In line 22 Meritt supplied [πλ]ἐν τῆς αἰρέσεως|[τ]ὸν ἀνδρῶν, which would strengthen my point if accepted. Meiggs and Lewis do not adopt it,

but it is not clear how *they* would construe the phrase or whether any other meaning could be found here. Exemption from appointing collectors seems to be the point.

<sup>25</sup> *Op.cit.*, pp.3 and 14.

<sup>26</sup> *Op.cit.*, pp.8 f. They fairly agree that the condition of the surface of the stone has not changed significantly since the first editors' days.

incised but the rough scars in the marble form the expected shapes and we withhold dots.' On the sixth *stoichos* of line 10 in col. ii they comment: 'There is a suggestion of rho in an oval-shaped hollow.' But this time they do not choose to print even a dotted letter, though it is the 'expected' one.<sup>27</sup> On line 37 in col. iii they observe: 'The omicron is a series of punches forming the expected rounding'.<sup>28</sup> Finally I group three typical and revealing judgements on col. iv: 'The apparent lower and right side of a circular letter between the first and second *stoichoi* cannot be authentic cutting . . . The first letter of line 57 appears to be circular; it may have inspired Rangabé's rho . . . We see no credible evidence of engraving in line 58. The only possible circular scar lies to the left of the first *stoichos*.'<sup>29</sup>

We may now confront their considered judgement on col. ii.23. 'We see enough of the letters printed', they claim, 'to make the reading sure: the horizontals of epsilon, the bow of rho, the upper tips of the iotas, the circular scar of omicron. We cannot identify any trace of the first letter.' Combining this with earlier editors' notes I would suggest [.]  $\Xi$   $\supset$  [.] 'O' as a reasonable transcription of what they actually 'saw' on the stone.<sup>30</sup> Now the circular scar has always been taken for omicron or theta and meets both their criteria for acceptance. It leads to a credible restoration (unlike Pittakys's *Περὺθιοι*), and it is right in the middle of its *stoichos*. This does not prove it right. It still could be no more a letter than that 'only possible circular scar near . . . to the left of the first *stoichos*'.<sup>31</sup>

The quota preserved against the name in col. iii.23 is HHH. Thera was assessed for 5 talents in 425 B.C. (quota<sup>π</sup>), so that the amount is at least credible for Thera earlier.<sup>32</sup> But it was also a common Island tribute before the war. Methodologically then alternatives to Thera—other than Chalkis (col. iii.13)—should be considered. Only one has any credibility. Hephaisteia on Lemnos should have appeared in the main Island panel this year, when its neighbours Myrina and Imbros were registered separately in a special category.<sup>33</sup> The ethnic is normally spelt 'Εφαιστιᾶς in the lists, but it must be restored as [b] εφ[αισ]τι [ἔς|b]ο[ι ἐν Λέμνῳ] in ATL ii A 9, col. i.95 f. The tribute assessed in 425 B.C. was 4 talents.<sup>34</sup> I therefore suggest the reading HHH [H] ΕΦ[Α]Ι[Σ]Τ[Ι]ΕΣ for List 26 col. iii.23. When I was in Athens recently I examined the stone very carefully to see whether this reading was possible. I found nothing that would rule it out. 'The circular scar of omicron' may well not be a letter at all. To the right of Bradeen and McGregor's second iota the surface is so worn that I doubt whether any letters once there would still show. Significantly they read very few letters at this point in the whole of col. iii, and they do not dismiss Rangabé's *Περὺθιοι* on the grounds that their second iota must be the *last* letter.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Op.cit., pp.9 and 12 f. (they print Στ[α]γ[ι]φ[ι]ται).

<sup>28</sup> Op.cit., p.15. This description, which might suggest that chisel cuts survived, should be compared with one that follows—'The top of the omicron . . . survives in colour; the bottom and right side are cutting; on the left a series of punches joins colour and cutting.'

<sup>29</sup> Op.cit., pp.18 f. See especially Rangabé, *Antiquités helléniques* i, no. 224.

<sup>30</sup> Op.cit., p.14. See especially Rangabé,

*Antiquités helléniques* i, no. 223.

<sup>31</sup> Op.cit., p.19. Pittakys ('Εφ.Αρχ.1853, no. 1252) also read *Βεργᾶιοι* in line 24!

<sup>32</sup> ATL ii A 9, col.i.9.

<sup>33</sup> See on this Bradeen and McGregor, op.cit., p.14. They wanted to restore Hephaisteia in col.iii.26 opposite the appropriate quota HHH.

<sup>34</sup> See ATL i.280 f. (Register) for the evidence.

<sup>35</sup> Michael Osborne kindly helped me examine this part of the stone in the

The case of Thera demonstrates neatly how evidence may clash and what we may have to contemplate doing as a result. Epigraphic expertise is an enviable gift, but it must be kept subordinate. We have good testimony now on Thera's status before 425 B.C. Like Samos it was saddled with an indemnity, and for a time it paid no tribute. This fact makes reading the 'circular scar' as omicron no longer 'credible'. It cannot any more be termed 'the expected reading' because historically we have no reason to expect it.

*University of Leeds*

HAROLD B. MATTINGLY

Epigraphic Museum in August 1976 and would, I think, agree with this judgement of mine at least. I am also most grateful to the *CQ* reader for some pertinent criticism. I

have tried to take proper account of his points and the article has gained somewhat in presentation.